DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 655 HE 017 423

AUTHOR Corcoran, Mary; Clark, Shirley M.
TITLE Development of Guidelines for Policy-Relevant Studies of Faculty Vitality through an Institutional Case Study.
SPONS AGENCY Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; College Environment; *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; *Faculty College Relationship; *Guidelines; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Organizational Climate; Personnel Policy; Research Needs; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Morale; Teacher Role; Teaching (Occupation); Teaching Conditions; *Work Attitudes; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

The issue of faculty vitality and an institutional case study are discussed, along with implications for academic policy. The literature of faculty vitality reveals a situational, contextual dimension that makes defining the concept difficult. It is helpful to view the college as an organization in which faculty members pursue careers as scholars, teachers, and researchers. Aspects of organizational behavior that relate to definitions of vitality include: organizational change, boundaries and boundary maintenance (macro and micro approaches), internal environments, control systems, reward systems, and job satisfaction and morale. At the University of Minnesota, interviews were conducted with samples of faculty members to explore models of faculty vitality and as a basis for the development of comparative data (a representative group, a highly active group, and a delayed promotion group). Information is presented on indicators of vitality for the three faculty groups, faculty work characteristics and values, work behavior, work preferences, satisfaction/dissatisfaction, and appraisals of the institutional environment. Definitions of vitality proposed by six researchers/writers are included in chart form. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245655

March 1983

Development of Guidelines for Policy-Relevant Studies of Faculty Vitality Through an Institutional Case Study

Mary Corcoran

Shirley M. Clark

Higher Education Program

University of Minnesota

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

U.S.A.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
in Montreal, Canada, in April, 1983.

Printed in U.S.A.

We are grateful to the University of Minnesota Graduate School Grant-in-Aid of Research Program and the College of Education for funds which supported the research activities.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Corcoran

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NIE-017 423

1

INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with a key component of University quality, the continued vitality of its faculty. Drawing upon the experience which we have had in planning and conduction an investigation of this topic, including an exploratory case study of University of Minnesota faculty, it describes the approach that we have taken to design an inquiry dealing with this highly complex and nebulous topic. The steps in this plan include:

1. Using a poorly-defined concept, which faculty vitality certainly is, as a heuristic device sensitizing the investigators to consider a wide range of potentially relevant perspectives.
2. Selecting analytic approaches that lead to actionable insights by varied decision-makers, including individual faculty, colleague groups, institutional administrators.
3. Developing a data base tapping a range of individual and organizational variables that can be used in exploring a variety of analytic approaches.
4. Using results of initial analyses to target specific aspects of faculty vitality concern for further attention. In some cases identification of potential problems may be all that is needed or desirable; in other cases, further investigations may be suggested.

This study approach is presented at this session, which is concerned with critical variables in policy studies, not so much because of the topic of investigation, although it may well be of concern to any academic group, but as an illustration of an approach to a general problem common to many policy studies that address nebulous but important issues. In addition, this inquiry deals with an interesting set of questions as to who is the potential user of the findings. Institutional studies of faculty have tended to emphasize a management perspective, although faculty data is one of the least satisfactory aspects of management

information. Measurements of the work of faculty members, in a fashion that meets the demands of precision that academic planning and accounting seeks, have been lacking for a variety of reasons, including, as Gonyea (1980) points out, the ill-defined nature and complex interaction of faculty activities, and the reluctance of faculty to report them. This reluctance may be based on a variety of motives, including resistance to infringements on the faculty members' prized autonomy of action, as well as skepticism about attempts at objective analysis of something as complex as a faculty member's work.

The way in which we have addressed the problem is to view faculty vitality as involving, as it in fact does, individual and organization interactions. We thus focus on several kinds of actions, both from the perspective of the institution and the individual faculty member. Although the power structure of university academic life is an unusually complex one, we judge that comparable situations arise in other study situations in which the question of whose interests are to be served, and who can take relevant action are also pertinent.

In arriving at our study directions, we were guided by the advice of Trow (1965) that one should seek "fuller understanding of institutions and what goes on within them, rather than by trying to focus too directly on a specific decision." It was our intent that we would aim first to try to "illuminate" understanding of the complex issue of faculty vitality, through whatever insights we could bring to it and through examination of the situation from broader perspectives than a concern with immediate problem solution.

We were also influenced by the Lindblom and Cohen (1979) cautions on the use of professional social inquiry in social problem-solving, particularly with respect to the value of designing professional-social inquiry so that it can facilitate the social learning required to change attitudes and dispositions. Our approach to this question is to proceed in a manner that recognizes the attitudes and positions of potential decision-makers, the faculty members themselves, and suggests directions of inquiry that could inform and broaden them.

The report will include a brief summary of the faculty vitality issue and of the approach we took to conceptualize the vitality concept. This is followed by a description of the University case study that we are conducting and a report of findings of that study with potential policy impact. It concludes with suggested directions for inquiry by those concerned with academic policy.

FACULTY VITALITY AS A POLICY ISSUE

The phrase "faculty vitality" conjures up a mixed bag of characteristics, including teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and also a deeply sought but hard to pin down quality of creativity and renewal. It may be easier to point to cases where it is absent than to describe what it is.

There was not, in fact, very much interest in considering the matter until recently. During the post-war decade, when American colleges and universities were in an unprecedented stage of growth, continually adding new recruits to the faculty body, and providing established faculty members with attractive opportunities for advancement through moves, it was taken for granted that the normal circumstances of faculty life, including preparation as a graduate student, selection and promotion criteria, salary and reward incentives, and the recognition of professional success by colleagues, provided sufficient stimulation for continued growth and productive work throughout the faculty member's career. If there were exceptions, as of course was the case, these were regarded as unfortunate, but were not a matter of great concern.

This comfortable stage of assurance is now past. A number of position papers, including those of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1980), the National Science Foundation Advisory Council (1978), and others raise the spectre of an anticipated, if not already operative, problem of declining faculty vitality. Deterioration in the conditions of academic work, brought about by declines in enrollment and associated financial support, changes in the character of student bodies, shifts in the demands for fields of study,

and declines in research support, are expected at a time when a large proportion of faculties hold tenured positions (Riesman, 1980; Baldridge et al, 1978).

From an institutional perspective, the prospect for institutional vitality appears threatened by inabilities to add new faculty, who would bring with them fresh ideas as well as specialization in desired fields. The institution is seen as left with a "greying" faculty, declining in productivity, and unable to respond to new demands. From a national, or indeed global, perspective, there is concern about the consequences of a "lost generation of scholars" (Radner and Kuh, 1978).

Individual faculty members may find themselves "stuck" in their careers with a general decline in prospects for mobility and opportunities for advancement. Other problems are also anticipated, including loss of opportunity to maintain the thrust toward the recruitment of women and minorities.

Responses to this situation at the national level have focussed on efforts to ensure through federal and foundation support a continued flow of graduate students and the appointments of new faculty in critical areas (Commission on Human Resources, 1979). These efforts are too recent and too limited in scope to have had measurable impact as yet.

More attention has been given to offering institutional programs under the general rubric of faculty development (Centra, 1983), based on the belief that a key problem is how to enliven the tired faculty member, provide him or her with new skills and perhaps attitudes, and outfit them with the skills required to teach a new and challenging clientele.[1] Varied consultants are prepared to pro-

---

[1]The aging faculty member is seen as presenting a particularly serious vitality problem in research as well as teaching, because of assumptions about declining productivity, adaptability to field changes, and to the teaching of new student generations. In our view these expectations ignore the evidence that the age-productivity relationship is a complex one, and varies greatly by field and individual. There is evidence that highly-productive faculty maintain productivity, although it may take different forms, into their sixties, whereas evidence of declining productivity in others is evident at much earlier ages. Early-retirement programs, as a means of removing less productive faculty, although certainly of value, do not address the problems of declining mid-life productivity.

vide such services, and of course many institutions have had long-standing programs of instructional improvement. To the best of our knowledge, these faculty development efforts are focussed almost entirely on instruction, and tend to ignore the concerns of faculty as scholars and members of professional and academic communities.

These latter concerns are of course addressed by sabbatical and research leave programs. In our own institution, the single quarter leave system, a fully-funded period competitive program for intensive activity, has been very well received. The sabbatical has, however, proven to be attractive to only a minority of eligible faculty, because of the financial loss involved in a 50% pay plan. (Recently, a program of supplementary support under a competitive program, supported by a Bush Foundation grant, for faculty whose activities promise to improve their scholarly competence and undergraduate teaching, has been introduced.)

The authors of this paper came to the consideration of faculty vitality from backgrounds that involved both interest in academic personnel policies, and also as of scholarly interest. We recognized that universities will be facing serious problems in academic personnel planning in future years, but we were not at all sure that what was being identified as a problem of faculty vitality, and what was being proposed to solve it, matched well with the circumstances of faculty life as we saw them. We also saw that the recommendations for faculty development docussed on changing the individual, but ignored the organizational and institutional contexts that shape and structure faculty careers. We saw considerable evidence of overgeneralization. Problems of obsolescence that are of particular concern today in engineering and the sciences, are quickly generalized to faculties-at-large, despite the quite different pace of change in various fields. Problems of primary concern to teaching in undergraduate colleges are also generalized to higher education-at-large.

Haunting the whole discussion is the tenure issue, which symbolizes an underlying confrontation between a management perspective that tries to apply the methods of efficient allocations of resources to tasks to an academic community in which faculty have, particularly in recent decades, achieved a hard fought sense of control over their destinies (Riesman, 1980).

It was our reflections on this situation, both in our own institution and elsewhere, that led us to propose three years ago the conduct of a study that would aim to identify individual and organizational conditions that make for effective, productive, creative faculty work. We sought support of this project as independent faculty research, rather than as an institutional research project, because we did not want to be charged with immediate responsibilities for arriving at recommendations for action; rather we wanted to try to understand better the circumstances of faculty work. We were fortunate in being able to receive funding for the project, and also excellent advisory help and consultation, both from faculty and specialist resources in our own University and elsewhere.

VITALITY AS A CONCEPT

As far as we have been able to determine in our review of literature, there is no "theory" of faculty and institutional vitality, at least not in any strict sense of the term "theory." Frequently, no attempt is made to define vitality (or related terms such as renewal or revitalization or productivity). It could be that contemporary writers assume that an adequate degree of agreement about meaning exists with respect to the concept. This assumption is open to question.

The social/behavioral sciences as well as education already seem burdened with ill-defined notions; however, as Bacharach and Lawler (1980) point out in their exposition on power -- an important but imprecise concept to be sure -- the theory-construction literature of the last 15 years reveals that ill-defined terms sometimes are critical to the theory-construction enterprise. This literature distinguishes two general types of concepts: primitive and derived. The

value of primitive terms is primarily heuristic, functioning to sensitize us to phenomena without providing precise ideas of hypotheses. Among their strengths, primitive concepts often:

> (1) reveal the complexity and multidimensionality of phenomena that might otherwise be treated in an oversimplified or unidimensional manner,
> (2) serve as integrative devices for analyzing seemingly disparate ideas, and
> (3) lead to more specific well-defined ideas (Bacharach & Lawler, 1980, p. 14).

Vitality, surely a primitive concept, may thus be useful for describing a complex phenomenon in higher education. Although it is difficult to say precisely what vitality <u>is</u>, what we can do is ask two questions: First, to what phenomenon does the concept of vitality sensitize us? And, second, what more concrete phenomena or ideas can we attempt to specify or measure that are derived from the concept of vitality?

<u>Definitions of Faculty and Institutional Vitality</u>

In this section several contemporary definitions of faculty and institutional vitality will be reviewed. Figure 1 provides a schematic guide that may be useful to the reader. -- Insert Figure 1 about here --

Several writers who have wrestled with the meaning of vitality as it applies to late 20th-century higher education credit John W. Gardner with stimulating their thinking (Peterson & Loye, 1967; Maher, 1982; Centra, 1983; and Clark, Boyer, and Corcoran, 1983). In two of his popular works, Gardner presents the reader with several kinds of theoretical statements or hypotheses about the capacities of individuals, institutions, and societies for adaptation and change. For example, from his earlier book, <u>Self-Renewal</u> (1963), the following ideas emerge:

> ...Continuous renewal depends upon conditions that encourage fulfillment of the individual.... (p. 2)

> Too often in the past we have designed systems to meet all kinds of exacting requirements except the requirement that they contribute to the fulfillment and growth of the participants.... It is essential that in the years ahead we undertake intensive analysis of the impact of the organization on the individual. (pp. 63-64)

And from a later book, Morale (1978), Gardner provides some synonyms for vitality, and some further statements of meaning:

"regeneration" (p. 13)

"re-creation" (p. 27)

"physical drive and durability" (p. 59)

"physical vigor" (p. 60)

"dedication to beliefs that require action" (p. 60)

"enthusiasm"..."zest"..."sense of curiosity"..."care about things"..."reach out"..."enjoy"..."risk failure" (p. 62)

"A society concerned for its own continued vitality will be interested in the growth and fulfillment of individual human beings -- the release of human potentialities" (p. 73)

In his Introduction to Conversations Toward a Definition of Institutional Vitality, Richard Peterson acknowledges the creative stimulation provided by John Gardner's concepts to the undertaking that would culminate a few years later in an inventory for measuring institutional functioning (Peterson & Loye, 1967). Peterson and his colleagues struggled with defining both institutional vitality and an idealized institution of higher learning. Discussants suggested that the definition should be multidimensional, should include the notion of the institutionalization of individual vitality, should not be elitist but open to the diversity of institutional types in the U.S., and should allow for the notion of dynamic (ebbing and flowing) vitality.

This early work by scholars at the Educational Testing Service predated the range of systematic attempts in the 1970s to undertake curricular reviews and reforms, to initiate and institutionalize faculty development, to improve and evaluate instruction, and to experiment with organizational and administrative development activities. However, conditions and issues in academe continued to change throughout the 1970s, and while they seem to have intensified concern for faculty and institutional vitality, they also have added to the complexity of the matter.

Although some of these conditions were mentioned earlier, we should also consider institutional-environmental shifts such as the economic straits of the nation and the states, the increase in regulations and statutes that affect many areas of academe including personnel policies -- and along with this a more litigious climate generally -- and, of course, the movement to embrace collective bargaining.

Persuaded that maintenance of institutional vitality and survival are linked in small private colleges that expect to survive in the 1980s, James Ebben and Tom Maher (1979) viewed institutional vitality as involving:

> -A clearly designed and accepted mission for the unit in question.
> -Direction, attainable goals, and programs which enable fulfillment of the mission.
> -A climate which empowers individuals to be participants in the fulfillment of the mission and to have the sense of being involved in a creative, productive and energizing work life (1979, p. 2).

Later, Maher (1982) elaborated this definition by focussing on the faculty in the life of the institution: by providing for their security and respect, by providing a continual process of challenge and stimulation, and by recognizing those who contribute significantly to the institution (p. 7), Maher's most recent statement of institutional vitality summarizes these earlier efforts:

> In essence, then, the quest for vitality might be said to focus on the capacity of the college or university to create and sustain the organizational strategies that support the continuing investment of energy by faculty and staff both in their own career and in the realization of the institution's mission (1982, p. 7).

This intertwining or interaction of institutional and faculty vitality is an important theme. Donald K. Smith sets "durable truisms" before us: "A university is its faculty" and "The excellence of a university is the excellence of its faculty" (1978, p. 1). These suggest to him that inquiry into faculty vitality needs to address academic personnel policies, including how faculty members are selected, socialized, promoted, and rewarded. These policies and procedures evolve from the philosophy and mission of an institution and from the form of governance appropriate to such a mission. This strikes us as a very interesting

and significant observation, implying as it does that ideal types of faculty vitality will differ according to institutional type and mission. Thus, for example, at a large, land-grant, research-oriented institution such as the University of Minnesota where the mission is tripartite (i.e., teaching, research, and service, a draft position paper on planning strategies contains the following definition of faculty vitality:

> A faculty is vital if it exhibits sustained productivity in its teaching, its research, and its service activities. Productivity is characterized not by quantity of output but by quality of these outputs as judged by faculty peers. A faculty is vital if it is continually creating important, new knowledge and expanding our understanding of the world in which we live. A faculty is vital if the instructional programs of the University are continually being monitored and developed. A faculty is vital if there is a balance between innovative and traditional approaches to teaching and research. The University faculty is vital if it is responding to the needs of the state, the nation, and the world for new knowledge. On occasions, this vitality is recognized through awards and prizes for scholarship. Perhaps most important a faculty is vital if its members find their work stimulating, enjoyable, and satisfying (Planning Council, University of Minnesota, 11 February 1980, p. 4).

Since it is well known that a division of either labor or functions exists between "teaching" and "research" institutions in higher education, and even within these kinds of institutions, value-laden definitions of faculty vitality will differ in their emphases for, say, two-year community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and universities with greater or lesser emphasis on research orientation. As Fulton and Trow (1974) have suggested, ideal types of academic roles include the expectation of continuing research activity in some universities and colleges, but not in others; in yet other institutions, teaching is emphasized and research is not a normal expectation.[2] Prevailing idea types of faculty roles to affect patterns of recruitment and socialization for faculty members. Reflected and reaffirmed in the reward structures, these ideal types may be linked with personel preferences, social origins, and other variables about which relatively little is known.

---

[2]Ladd (1979) argues that the research model holds sway throughout American higher education in the minds of faculty members, regardless of institutional type, and and adversely affects the weighting of reward structures.

In sum, notions of faculty vitality seem to have a situational, contextual dimension that makes defining the concept difficult at best without taking into account institutional type and mission. Doing so leads one to consider institutions both as employer and workplace, and as organizations in which faculty members pursue careers as scholars, teachers, and researchers.

Approaches to the Study of Vitality

We have identified elsewhere (Clark, Boyer and Corcoran, 1983) a variety of avenues of analytic approaches that might be used in developing vitality concepts. These include examination of the biographies of distinguished academics, comparative studies of institutions reputed to differ in vitality (Peterson and Loye, 1967), studies of the impact of changing institutions (Peterson, 1980), and studies of adult and career development (Robert Blackburn, 1979). In a related paper presented at this meeting, we have presented an analysis based on a professional socialization perspective (Clark and Corcoran, 1983). Here we focus on an organizational perspective.

Although one is not likely to find the term vitality in the vocabulary of the organizational scholar,[3] one does find attention to organizational change, e-fectiveness, and efficiency, and also to roles and individual behaviors that arise in the context of interaction. Aspects of organizational behavior that relate to definitions of vitality include:

1. Organizational change - Why do organizations with similar objectives, products, or services differ rather drastically in terms of survival and success (Aldrich, 1979)? How do the strategic decisions made by institutions mediate environmental constraints (Child, 1972)? What are the critical exogenous agents of change (Presthus, 1978)?

---

[3] For example, "vitality" is not listed in the subject index of the 1,740-page comprehensive Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Dunnette, 1976). Neither is it references in two popular sociology textbooks: Organization: Structure and Process (Hall, 1977) and Organizations and Environments (Aldrich, 1979).

2. Boundaries and boundary maintenance (macro approach). If when environments are resource-scarce and unstable, institutional viability becomes dependent upon the ability to mediate critical contingencies for the organization, how do effective organizations go about spanning their environments? How critical is that work to the adaptive capacities of institutions (Aldrich, 1979)?
3. Boundaries and boundary maintenance (micro approach). If, as it is argued, human systems flourish, depending upon boundary permeability and exchange, what evidence can we find that finding and regulating that level may be the key to survival and productivity of institutions (Pelz and Andrews, 1966)?
4. Internal environments. How do such dimensions of organizational climates as individual autonomy and responsibility, degree of structure imposed on the position, reward orientation and consideration, warmth, and managerial and peer support, affect individual and group behaviors (Payne and Pugh, 1976)?
5. Control systems. We are familiar with a variety of control systems in higher education including roles, regulations, standard policies and procedures, budgets, management-information systems, student evaluation of instruction, and faculty activity (productivity) reports. A variety of questions can be asked about the degree to which control systems have functional or dysfunctional consequences for faculty vitality (Laurence and Lorsch, 1967; Lawler, 1976).
6. Reward systems. Closely related to control systems, but focussed on professional judgements affecting promotion and salary, rewards systems are assumed to be related to faculty performance and vitality, but not in simple or well-understood ways (Lewis and Becker, 1979). How reward systems, as with control systems, affect the vitality of faculty, favorably or unfavorably, and under what kind of conditions is not well understood at present.
7. Job satisfaction and morale. Only negligible relationships appear to be shown between satisfaction and level of performance or productivity, accord-

ing to one writer, on the basis of over 3,000 published studies of job satisfaction and morale (Locke, 1976). Questions that arise about the conditions under which job satisfaction would be related to high or low productivity, as well as the reverse.

As this outline indicates, there is a rich array of possibilities, and we have undoubtedly not exhausted them. At this time, we have chosen to focus on the institutional environment in relation to faculty work styles and values.

DESCRIPTION OF EXPLORATORY CASE STUDY

Study Design Considerations

The key decision regarding our plan to develop a data base for our project was that it would be a qualitative institutional case study. A qualitative approach, using extended interviews, seemed to fit best the generalized nature of the research problem, the ambiguities and complexities of the concept of faculty vitality which forestall easy operationalization, and the relative accessibility of thoughtful and cooperative "expert" respondents.[4] An institutional study followed from out emphasis on faculty vitality as involving individuals in specific institutional environments.

A further decision to conduct this study at our own university can be viewed as problematic. There may well be problems in studying something so close to ourselves. This issue arises whenever an inquiry uses participant observers. In this case, we have chosen to use it as to advantage, drawing upon the faculty members whom we have studied as sources both on their own situation and as reporters of their environmental circumstances. We do not view them as unbiased, nor are we ourselvey, but we believe the attitudes that they express are part of the issue under consideration.

---

[4] Attributes of the qualitative paradigm include: concern with understanding behavior from the actor's own frame of reference; closeness to the data (having an "insider's" perspective); grounded, discovery-oriented, exploratory, expansionist, descriptive, and inductive; process-oriented; valid; "real," "rich," and "deep" data; ungeneralizable, single case studies; holistic; assumes a dynamic reality (Reichardt and Cook, 1979, p. 10).

Study Samples

A second set of decisions involved the choice of individuals to be interviewed. We conducted these interviews in two phases, the first in 1980-81 and the second in 1981-82. For Phase I we selected samples of tenured faculty members who met criteria for inclusion into a highly active ideal type who continuously publish, teach and perform administrative and/or professional services at highly productive levels.[5] We concentrated on tenured faculty members because judgements of success represented by these criteria could only be made of faculty who, having passed the tenure test, continue to meet the criteria.

These faculty were identified by broadly knowledgeable faculty and administrative colleagues in four sample sites: the College of Biological Sciences, the physical sciences and mathematics departments of the Institute of Technology, and the traditional social sciences and humanities departments of the College of Liberal Arts. These fields were selected because they represent the core university arts and science disciplines. We did not include fine arts or professional schools in this initial study because the dual nature of their professional socialization and the linkage of work to fields of professional practice as well as the academic sphere would require a more complex approach to vitality study than we could undertake in this initial study.

At least two judges recommended each tenured associate of full professor nominated for inclusion. We recognized that this is simply one ideal type model of faculty vitality but it is a strongly positive one about which there is widespread consensus in a large research-oriented university.

After Fall Quarter 1980 began, faculty nominees were contacted by letters which invited their participation in a lengthy tape-recorded interview. The let-

---

[5] In the editor's introduction to a special issue of Sociology of Education, Donald Light observes that Fulton and Trow in their paper "Research Activity in Higher Education" (in the same issue) have located "one breed of faculty who does everything -- publish, teach and administrate. As the authors say, this researcher is clearly not isolated in his laboratory or study. Instead he is a triple threat: you can't keep a good man down" (Light, 1974, p. 23).

let or invitation was followed up with telephone calls. The response and cooperation was excellent. Only four of the total number contacted expressed unwillingness to be interviewed and at the end of February, 1981, scheduled interviews for a total of sixty-three were completed. One or the other of us conducted each interview, since our involvement seemed to be facilitative of full and open responses from colleagues. On average, interviews extended over a two-hour period or longer.

Then in order to extend the exploratory inquiry of models of faculty vitality and as a basis for development of comparative data, representative samples were drawn from the same University colleges during Phase II, conducted 1981-82. Applying stratified random sampling procedures to specially drawn personnel data system listings, requisite proportions of tenured associate and full professors were obtained, a similar process was used to invite participation, and eighty-four interviews were completed.

The Phase II sample included sixty-six cases selected by a random number procedure within college and rank groups. This was designated the representative group. Then, in order to identify a group that would be more likely to include less productive, less vital faculty, an additional group of sixteen faculty who had held the rank of associate professor for nine years or more, was identified. This group, plus sixteen members of the representative group who had a similar promotion history, formed a delayed promotion group.[6] (There is thus an overlap of sixteen cases between the representative group and the delayed promotion group. There is no overlap between the highly active Phase I group and the representative group.)

Interview Guide Development

The interview guide consists of approximately fifty questions, some of which

[6]We do not assume that all faculty who experience delays in promotion present vitality problems, but that within this group they would be more frequent.

contain sub-parts and probes, and almost all of which are open-ended. In a few instances, questions were adapted from those used in other studies. For example, questions concerning research and teaching interests and orientations were adapted from Trow's Carnegie Commission on Higher Education study of faculty activities (1975); questions concerning some aspects of professional socialization, career and work rewards, and the relevance of collegiality to performance were adapted from studies of teachers done by Lortie (1975). In several instances, other conceptualizations, e.g., the one life - one career imperative and the psychological sense of community (Sarason, 1977) or the ideas of opportunity and power structures (Kanter, 1979), stimulated development of questions.

In order to achieve a quasi-longitudinal perspective, the questions and their sequencing were planned to explore retrospective, present and future aspects of the faculty member's career in the organization. Specifically, question areas included: 1) the decision to pursue an academic career; 2) graduate school dimensions of career socialization; 3) career stages and socialization as a faculty member; 4) work interests and preference orientations; 5) dimensions of productivity and success; 6) morale, satisfaction and perceptions of change; and 7) appraisals and future considerations.

Data Analysis

In order to facilitate data analysis, the interview tapes were transcribed into verbatim typescript. Coding of both the interviews and the respondent *vitae* was completed using an inductively-derived survey code which we developed to accomplish the empirical categorization of the responses. Interrater agreement exercises were undertaken to assure that the procedure met adequate standards of reliability. In addition to the descriptive analysis facilitated by the coding of data for processing to obtain numerically-based patterns of response, prospective content analysis of each interview will be aimed at discovery of themes, patterns and relationships in the data.

1.

For this paper the study samples were categorized in three groups:

		N	
Phase II:	Representative Group	66	
Phase I:	Highly Active Group	63	
Phase II:	Delayed Promotion Group, drawn in part from Phase II, Representative Group, plus an additional group also interviewed in Phase II	16) 16)	32

As the tabulation of group characteristic- in Figure 1 indicates, the representative and highly active groups are similar in sex distribution; however, the highly active group includes a larger proportion of younger faculty (27% in their thirties versus 17%), and fewer older faculty (34% fifty or older versus 53%). The samples for both of these groups were stratified by rank and field so the similarity in these percentages was by design.

The delayed promotion group, which consists of faculty who either held the associate professor rank for nine or more years before promotion, or who have been in that rank for nine or more years, turned out to be evenly distributed between the two ranks. The selection criteria essentially eliminated 30-year-olds from this group, but two-thirds were in their forties.

VITALITY RELATED RESPONSES

Dimensions of Vitality

A number of the interview questions were designed to assess dimensions of faculty vitality. This assessment will require considerably more investigation of individual review transcripts before it can be definitive, but our initial examination of coded responses identified several potentially useful indicators:

INDICATOR DIRECTION		REPRE-SENT. GROUP %	HIGHLY ACTIVE GROUP %	DELAYED PROM. GROUP %
+	Rate themselves more successful than peers	57	70	32
+	Never experienced a career block	57	54	38
+	Experienced no change or increase in productivity	41	48	37
-	Experienced no change or increase in energy level	38	53	52
-	Feel blocked in career now	16	10	17
-	Have experienced decrease in productivity	25	18	26
-	Have experienced change in morale	48	43	64
-	Have experienced decrease in energy level	62	47	48

On all of the indicator items tabulated, excepting those assessing energy level, the proportions of the highly active group responding in the more vital direction exceeded that of the delayed promotion group, suggesting that self-ratings, career block experience, and changes in morale and productivity are all potentially useful indicators of vitality. However, productivity declines, reported by 25% and "uneven" productivity reported by 34% of the representative group, were most often attributed to changes in nature of responsibilities (e.g., added administrative work) or to personel factors (energy, organization), whereas both productivity increases and uneven productivity were more often attributed to timing factors, such as "My field of research takes time," "My research is just now blossoming." Refinement of the productivity assessments will therefore require further consideration of such attributions.

Reported decline in energy level was highest (62%) for the representative group, which may be related to the higher percentage of the faculty over fifty years of age in that group (43%) than in the other groups. Respondents did express

some age-associated explanations when they made these assessments, coupled sometimes with the comment that they had learned how the system works, and how to use work-time and energies better than in earlier years, thus becoming more efficient.

Assessment of Vitality Level of Faculty

Our best assessment now of the general level of vitality in the faculty groups surveyed was that they typically considered themselves to be among the "moving" rather than the "stuck," to borrow Kanter's terms (1977). They have high self-esteem, value their competence and accomplishment, and see their work as a centralized interest which demands energy and engagement. In short, they rank above average in opportunity, as mobility and growth are structured in complex organizations (Kanter, 1977, pp. 246-47). Although the characteristic pattern was thus of vital faculty, clearly there were a few in each group who gave one or more indications of possibly declining vitality. This was more often the case in the delayed promotion group, although there were some in the representative group and more rarely in the highly active group.

The highly active group was differentiated primarily in the self-rating of success and energy items; the latter may be related to the younger age of the highly active group. We judged that this group overlaps considerable in vitality with the representative group, and that the typical tenured faculty member in the fields surveyed stands relatively high on the vitality indicators. In other words, we would note that the representative group includes many individuals who would correspond in type to the highly active group, as well as a lesser number who overlap with the delayed promotion group.

FACULTY WORK CHARACTERISTICS AND VALUES

An examination of how the faculty members who were interviewed described their work, what they liked about it and what they did not, and what were their underlying priorities, was made as a foundation for interpreting appraisals of the institutional environment as supportive or hindering their success.

Work Behavior

We begin with the examination of estimates of how much time is spent on career-related work, and how it is distributed. (See Table 2.) These faculty believe that they work hard, generally reporting work weeks of 50 hours or more, with a good number, especially in the highly active group, reporting working 60 hours a week or more (46%). Not surprisingly, 69% of the highly active group say that they work harder than their colleagues.

Most had difficulty when asked how they divided their time among the teaching, research, and administrative/service functions. This was partly because teaching and research are very much interwoven for many of them, especially in their work with graduate students. They were most sure, however, of their teaching time, of which the most typical report was that they spent 40% or more time on this function. Their teaching loads (as represented by number of courses taught per year) vary remarkably, but the median response for the representative group was 4-5 courses, with 4 being more typical of the highly active group, and 5 of the delated promotion group. Some differentiation of teaching load related to research productivity seems to be present; the highly active group did tend to allocate a lesser proportion of time to teaching.

The percentages of time allotted to research, with 55% of the representative group estimating that they spend 40% on this function, seems high. Other studies of University of Minnesota faculty (Stecklein, 1982) have yielded lower medians. This perhaps inflated time may better represent what faculty members want to do, rather than what they actually do.

Not only as we shall see are teaching loads seen as restraints on research, but also administrative and service activities. Especially those within the University, including department, college, and all University responsibilities, were seen as a "significant drain" on research time by many faculty. This was particularly so for the highly active group, which was, of course, selected for their

strong contribution to all three University functions. Although the typical pattern, for 52% of the representative group, was 20% or less administrative/service, one-third of the highly active group estimated that they spend more than 30% time on such activities. This estimate is supported by the fact that the highly active group claim more involvement than their colleagues in University affairs (49%), collegiate affairs (65%), and department affairs (79%).

Almost all faculty (86%) reported some outside consulting activity, but many of them indicated that this represented a relatively small contribution and largely represented relatively sporadic activities, such as reviewing manuscripts, etc. Less than one-fourth do very much consulting.

Work Preferences

The tensions expressed in the time reports, with respect to drains on research time, which we will see later will be reflected in their attitudes toward their career satisfactions and dissatisfactions, are also evident in the priorities given to research vs. teaching. This question is substantially the same as one used in the large-scale Carnegie Commission survey of faculty members (Trow, 1975). A report of a subgroup of the Carnegie study, drawn from high-quality universities, showed responses that closely paralleled that of the representative group, specifically: "Very heavily to research," 9%; "Both, leaning to research," 41%; "Both, leaning to teaching," 35%; and "Very heavily to teaching," 15% (Fulton and Trow, 1974). The preference pattern for the Minnesota group is clearly consistent with the priorities of a research university, and that of their colleagues generally at other institutions. The responses of the highly active faculty group showed a stronger bias toward the research end of the continuum than either of the other Minnesota groups, and than the national group studied by the Carnegie Commission, with 31% of that group claiming that they were very heavily oriented to research. Very few faculty in the entire group gave a very heavy priority to teaching. (See Table 3.)

Satisfactions/Dissatisfactions

The attitudes which underlie faculty work are suggested by responses to a question which we phrased as follows:

> No occupation is perfect. What makes your career most satisfying and enjoyable? Least satisfying and enjoyable? Are your satisfactions and dissatisfactions what you expected when you originally made your career decisions?

The most frequent responses to this question are shown in Table 3. Respondents named considerably more satisfactions than dissatisfactions, as a rule. Work with students, especially graduate students, mentioned by almost half (49% of the representative group), the opportunity to work with ideas (35%), and particularly important for the highly active group, the work freedom, e.g., freedom to set one's own schedule, to select one's own focus of interest, and to be your own boss. Other satisfactions concerned aspects of academic life, such as relationships with colleagues, and teaching experiences.

By far the major source of dissatisfaction was the time required for bureaucratic routines (e.g., paperwork) and committees, mentioned by 50% of the representative group. Surprisingly, given the general concern about faculty salaries, this was offered by only 24%, whereas in other surveys of the University of Minnesota faculty (Stecklein, 1982), in which this item has been included in a checklist, the dissatisfaction rate is much higher (45%). It may be that faculty regard this matter as so prevalent an aspect of academic careers that they do not think to mention it spontaneously, but would certainly note it if asked to react to it. Elsewhere in the course of the interview, they did in fact overwhelmingly (by 90% or more) indicate that academic careers have declined in financial reward, and this was frequently mentioned as a consideration discouraging consideration of academic careers today.

Of the less-frequently-mentioned dissatisfactions, one of particular importance to the highly active group was the splintering of energies and abilities, due to the multifaceted nature of their responsibilities, what we have called "role fragmenta-

tion." This seems clearly related to the efforts that this group has made to perform well in the entire range of functions. The aspects of teaching that this group noted as particularly unsatisfying were such things as repetitive teaching and grading of papers, which may also reflect a feeling that time that should be given to their higher priority work of research and creative teaching is being wasted in routine activity.

Dissatisfactions related to inability to influence departmental or university governance, or to funding problems, such as the pressure to get grants, or general lack of resources, were mentioned by fewer faculty, although they were of particular salience for some.

INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT APPRAISALS

A recurring theme throughout the interviews concerned the general quality of the institutional environment as it reflected concern for scholarly interests. Faculty provided appraisals of the environment in several ways, but two questions specifically solicited them:

> In thinking about the (institutional) conditions, situations, or factors which have been conducive to your success, which one seems to have facilitated it? Which seem to have interfered with it? (If asked for illustrations we mentioned such things as work assignments, relationships, funding opportunities, faculty development provisions, services, etc.)
>
> In your experience as a faculty member, do you feel that colleagues and "the system" (including such things as the rewards structure) have encouraged you to explore and take risks in your teaching and research?

The most frequent categories of response to these questions are shown in Table 4.

Supportive Environment

The importance attached to being part of a stimulating university environment, and one that was seen as supportive of faculty interest, is seen in the frequency of a mention by about half of the representative group as a condition supportive of faculty success. Also, it should be noted that about one-third of the group found some aspects of the environment that interfered with or hindered their work. Faculty spoke particularly of the importance of administrative attitudes and behavior

reflecting scholarly concerns. A biologist spoke of this as a concern for sharpening or purposes:

> I think there's a crying need for a definition of purpose in the University...it would be a tremendous morale booster for the whole faculty if we could define our purposes better, let people know where they are going and give some direction to programs.

A mathematician lamented that environmental pressures are affecting academic leadership adversely:

> The main concern is that the universities are getting more and more administrative in nature and less educational. It's not just this university, it's happening all over the country...part of it is the accountability and part of it is the federal government.

And a psychologist argued that administrative responsibility extends to the interpretation of faculty interests and needs to the larger community:

> We need to create an atmosphere of creativity. It's people who will sell us. I think we need sales persons at the very high administrative levels and that, I think, not only has direct benefits in terms of giving us the resources we need, but I think has relevance within. And I guess I consider that one of their major functions is to interpret us and sell us to the outside world.

Research Time and Support

Next in importance, particularly on the negative side, were conditions affecting faculty research activity: Time required for work that interfered with research, particularly heavy teaching loads, and administrative or service responsibilities, were most often noted. Such hindrances were mentioned by 43% of the representative group, whereas load-related considerations supportive of research, including leaves and good teaching loads, were mentioned by 32% and 20% respectively. Clearly, there are differences in the situations that individuals experience in these respects.

Similarly, appraisals of facilities were divided, with some reporting strong support from specialized libraries and the computer system, whereas others complained strongly about laboratory and libraries.

The response to the questions on risk-taking perceptions was somewhat disquieting, particularly since this question relates most directly to the concept of

vitality proposed by Gardner and others. Considerably more of the faculty group in general, and of the highly active group, thought that they were discouraged than encouraged (38% versus 14% in the first case, and 42% versus 9% in the latter). Qualified responses, that only under certain conditions, such as when one had already proved oneself, was this possible, was a frequent alternative response (about 25%), and a similar proportion simply said they were personally indifferent to the system's attitude. Larger proportions of the delayed promotions group reported that they felt the system was discouraging, or qualified their responses (44% and 41% giving these responses).

DIRECTIONS FOR POLICY ACTION AND INQUIRY

In this section we aim to identify specific aspects of faculty vitality interest that emerge from our consideration of faculty work patterns and preferences and their environmental assessments. As Payne and Pugh (1975, p. 1126) note, it is only recently (since about 1965) that psychological research began to use organizational variables to explain changes in the more traditionally-chosen variables of morale and job satisfaction, a development that represents, in their view, the beginning of "organizational psychology," They have identified in their excellent review possible directions for inquiry into the interrelationships between organizational climate and characteristics of individual members. The potential for further inquiry within this perspective appears to us promising, but will require studies of larger scope than the type of institutional case study, which we have conducted. We can suggest at this point certain directions that might be explored which would not require formal inquiry, but rather action-oriented programs designed to draw on existing knowledge and the experience of acting upon interactive problem solving in Lindblom and Cohen's terms (1979, pp. 27-29).

Our approach to targeting such activity is to ask first, "What is the nature of the faculty vitality problem?" What we have learned thusfar indicates to us that in a university setting such as ours, the vitality problem will present itself most frequently as a problem of interrupted or declining productivity and scholar-

ship, and only secondarily, if at all, in teaching. This is not surprising news, but it does confront the problem quite directly. It is important to note that this problem is nearly always clearly perceived by the individual faculty members, and is reflected in their self-assessments of success.

Secondly, it can be said that on the basis of our observations of the group we have studied, we do not see faculty vitality as a widespread problem. Even in the group that experienced a delay in promotion, this was by no means always because of a vitality issue; certain lines of work simply take a great deal more time than others for the production of the kind of significant work required for tenure decisions. This was particularly so during the last ten years when the University moved to more explicit tenure guidelines. This fact explains in part the relative size of the group in their forties in the delayed promotion group.

But even though the problem involves a relatively small proportion of individuals, it is still a problem for them, for their colleagues, and for college administrators, department chairs and those on up the hierarchy. On the basis of our interviews, it is clear to us that some have been able to work through whatever difficulty held them up, but others have turned or have been turned to a focus primarily on instructional activity, with lessened rewards in the form of salary, as well as promotion.

We have explored elsewhere (Clark and Corcoran, 1983) one of the background factors that appear to lie behind this situation, the differences in the socialization to the role of a faculty member in a research university that various faculty received. We think it is important for institutions to consider that responsibilities for socialization continues as individuals enter their careers as faculty members. Departments need to give more explicit consideration to this process, particularly with probationary faculty.

But what about those already tenured? We are by no means convinced that individuals cannot find some ways of changing their work patterns, focussing their ef-

forts and organizing their energies in more productive ways. Some of the people we interviewed have pointed to the experience of locating a new field of investigation and gaining support for a new direction of inquiry. We think there could be more of this, and that universities like our own need to give attention to encouraging it more systematically. Some of this is done now through provisions of seed grants to experienced faculty who need to shift fields of inquiry, as well as to investigators at earlier career stages. But it may be that assistance is needed of another kind with some individuals, who may need some stimulus to consider the possibility of change, as well as potential directions.

The academic world has not in the past had much liking for formal personnel development programs. For many faculty they would be anathema, regarded as intrusive and probably incompetent to understand the nature of the problems. We do see, though, that faculty colleagues and department chairs could serve a more constructive and supportive role in some instances, drawing upon their own experience, and possibly use of consultant help. It might be of value for a university like our own to find a cooperative department which would be willing to try out such a program, and see if it could develop a model for such action.

But there are also faculty who are indeed "stuck" and for whom there seems to be no possibility for change. As Sarason (1977) has pointed out so well, academics as well as other professionals seem to have a one life - one career imperative. It is as if they had taken vows, someone has said, and a change of career represents a denial of commitment. Here too, we think that individuals might benefit from awareness of possibilities for change that they may not have considered. Colleagues and institutions can and are finding ways to facilitate midcareer moves, but at this time at our university, only in those programs designated for termination or diminishment are outplacement, severance or early retirement options extended to affected faculty. Extension of these options to others may make sense, and we would think should be considered.

Thus far we have addressed ourselves to existing problems of vitality which may involve a relatively small proportion of faculty. In our view, the greater concern is for fostering vitality, particularly in those who are clearly productive, who work very hard trying to perform well a demanding set of activities, involving research, teaching and service.

We think that the analysis of the environmental conditions suggests some clear concerns about the interactive effects of the organizational climate and individual behavior. The University of Minnesota has some good things going for it, particularly its provision for research support of faculty, and its leave program, but it does need to look seriously at the faculty load situation. On the average, the teaching loads are not excessive, although there are indeed faculty who carry quite heavy loads. Many of these instances seem to result from the faculty members' own concern that certain courses should be taught, as much as institutional pressure for additional teaching. But there is some of the latter, too.

We think that at least for the highly active faculty members, the problem is more often one of demands on their time for department, college, and university committee work and administration. These demands have been increasing during a period when the University is implementing an extensive program of planning designed to address the demands of retrenchment in a way that will preserve institutional quality.

This new planning model has been introduced with the expectation that faculty participate actively in the setting of priority decisions at all levels (University of Minnesota, University Senate Minutes, 1982-83), a policy that is very much in keeping with the University's traditions of operation, and the preferences of many faculty. But it all takes time, and the people likely to be most involved are those that are most productive in other ways as well, and thus we have the role fragmentation we noted earlier.

Perhaps the most useful way of thinking about this issue is to consider it

within the general frame of reference of the power distribution within the institution, as well as between the institution and its external publics. All of these are undergoing change at this time, and the consequences of this situation, expressed as it is in tightening claims on resources, new demands for work, changes in field priorities, are bound to stress the system and the people within it. Some more specific acknowledgement of the fact that this is stressful, and some better articulated understanding why this is so, might remove some of the stress, at least by making it a more explicit target of attention, rather than a rather vague uncertainty as it now often is. What we have in mind here is a thoughtful inquiry into the nature of faculty-institution power distribution under changing circumstances. A study by McConnell and Mortimer (1978) has spoken particularly to the Minnesota tradition of joint faculty-administration cooperation in governance, in contrast to that at the University of California and other institutions. That tradition, in its present form, could well stand a careful appraisal, from a perspective informed by understanding of issues of authority and power.

It is curious that political scientists have given relatively little attention to this phenomenon within their own institutions. Perhaps the most complete studies of the phenomenon are those of Clark and Youn (1976) and Riesman (1968), but Baldridge et al (1978) have also considered the consequences of declining faculty power. We would propose further attention by scholars with backgrounds in varied disciplines to the distribution of power issues in ways which might help us all understand better what are the concerns and their implications for the life of the faculty.

References.

Aldrich, Howard E. Organizations and Environments. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1979.

Bacharach, Samuel B., and Edward J. Lawler. Power and Politics in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

Baldridge, Victor, David V. Curtis, George Ecker and Gary L. Riley. Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

Blackburn, Robert J. "Academic Careers: Patterns and Possibilities." Current Issues in Higher Education, 2 (1979), 3-12.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

Centra, John. "Maintaining Faculty Vitality Through Faculty Development." In Darrell Lewis and Shirley Clark, eds. Faculty Vitality in American Higher Education, unpublished manuscript, 1983.

Clark, Burton R., and Ted I. K. Youn. Academic Power in the United States: Comparative Historic and Structural Perspectives. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 3, 1976.

Clark, Shirley M. and Mary Corcoran. "Professional Socialization and Faculty Career Vitality," Paper read at the American Educational Research Association in Montreal, Canada in April, 1983.

Clark, Shirley, Carol M. Boyer, and Mary Corcoran. "Faculty and Institutional Vitality in Higher Education." In Darrell Lewis and Shirley Clark, eds. Faculty Vitality in American Higher Education, unpublished manuscript, 1983.

Child, John. "Organization Structure, Environment and Performance -- The Role of Strategic Choice." Sociology, 6 (January, 1972), 1-22.

Commission on Human Resources. Research Excellence Through the Year 2000. Washington DC: National Academy of Sciences, 1979.

Dunnette, Marvin D., ed. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand-McNally College Publishing Co., 1976.

Ebben, James, and Thomas H. Maher. "Capturing Institutional Vitality." Paper presented at Association for Institutional Research Annual Forum at San Diego, California, May 1979.

Fulton, Oliver, and Martin Trow. "Research Activity in American Higher Education." Sociology of Education, 74, No. 1 (Winter, 1974), 29-73.

Gonyea, Meredith A. "Determining Academic Staff Needs, Allocation and Utilization." In Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980, pp. 364-372.

Gardner, John W. Morale. New York: Norton, 1978.

Gardner, John W. Self-Renewal. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Hall, Richard H. Organizations: Structure and Process. Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe." Current Issues in Education, 1 (1979), 3-10.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Ladd, Everett Carll Jr. "The Work Experience of American College Professors. Some Data and an Argument." Current Issues in Higher Education, 2 (1979), 3-12.

Lindblom, C. E., and D. K. Cohen. Usable Knowledge: Social and Social Problem Solving. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Lawler, Edward E., III. "Control Systems in Organizations." In Marvin Dunnette, ed. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand-McNally College Publishing Co., 1976, pp. 1247-1291.

Lawrence, P. R., and Lorsch, J. W. Organization and Environment. Cambridge: Harvard Business School, 1967.

Lewis, Darrell R., and William E. Becker, Jr., eds. Academic Rewards in Higher Education. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1979.

Light, Donald. "Introduction: The Structure of the Academic Professions." Sociology of Education, 47 (1), (Winter, 174), 2-28.

Locke, Edwin A. "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction." In Marvin Dunnette, ed. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand-McNally College Publishing Co., 1976, pp. 1297-1349.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Maher, Thomas H. "Institutional Vitality in Higher Education." AAHE & ERIC Research Currents, AAHE Bulletin, 34, No. 10 (June, 1982).

Mortimer, K. P., and J. R. McConnell. Sharing Authority Effectively: Participation, Interaction, and Discretion. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

National Science Foundation Advisory Council. Report of Task Group #1: Continued Viability of Universities as Centers for Basic Research. Washington DC: October, 1978.

Payne, Roy, and Derek S. Pugh. "Organizational Structure and Climate." In Marvin Dunnette, ed. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand-McNally College Publishing Co., 1976, pp. 1125-1173.

Pelz, D. C., and Andrews, F. M. Scientists in Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Peterson, Marvin. "Faculty and Academic Responsiveness in a Period of Decline: An Organizational Perspective." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 31 (Spring, 1980), 95-104.

Peterson, Richard E., and D. E. Loye. Conversations Toward a Definition of Institutional Vitality. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1967.

Planning Council. "A Proposal for a Study on 'The Future Vitality of the Faculties of the University.'" Memorandum to President C. Peter Magrath, University of Minnesota, February, 1980.

Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society. Revised edition. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.

Radner, R., and C. V. Kuh. Preserving a Lost Generation: Policies to Assure a Steady Flow of Young Scholars Until the Year 2000. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1978.

Reichardt, Charles S., and Thomas D. Cook, eds. Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Evaluation Research. Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications, 1979.

Riesman, David. On Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

Sarason, Seymour B. Work, Aging and Social Change: Professionals and the One Life - One Career Imperative. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Smith, Donald K. "Faculty Vitality and the Management of University Personnel Policies." In Wayne B. Kirschling, ed. Evaluating Faculty Performance and Vitality. New Directions for Institutional Research, Volume 5, Number 4, 1978. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1-16.

Stecklein, John E. "Changes in Faculty Characteristics, Activities and Attitudes Over 25 Years at a Major United States University." Paper read at the European Association for Institutional Research meeting at Uppsala, Sweden, August, 1982.

Trow, Martin, ed. Teachers and Students: Aspects of American Higher Education. A Volume of Essays Sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Trow, Martin. "Social Research and Educational Policy." In Research in Higher Education; Guides to Institutional Decision. Papers delivered to the Invitational Conference on Educational Research, Harvard University, June 12-13, 1964. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965.

University of Minnesota. University Senate Minutes, No. 1, 1982-83 Series, November 18, 1982, p. 14.

Weiss, Carol H. "Policy Research in the Context of Diffuse Decision Making." Journal of Higher Education, 53 (1982), 619-639.

Figure 1. Definitions of Vitality.

Author(s)	Terms	Central Idea
Gardner, 1963, 1978	"Renewal," "Vitality," "Regeneration," etc.	The capacities of individuals, institutions, and societies for adaptation and change
Peterson & Loye, 1967	Institutional Vitality	Definition should be multidimensional, dynamic, include individual vitality, and allow for institutional differences
Ebben & Maher, 1979	Institutional Vitality	Interaction of mission, goals, programs, and institutional climate that enable individuals both to contribute to the mission and to realize the benefits that come from "a creative, productive and energizing work life"
Maher, 1982	Institutional Vitality	Same as above, but with added focus on individuals within an institutional context
Smith, 1978	Faculty Vitality	Interaction of faculty and institutional vitality
Planning Council, University of Minnesota, 1980	Faculty Vitality	"Sustained productivity" in teaching, research, and service activities, with focus on the faculty as a collective

Underlying theme of above definitions: Faculty vitality seems to be context- (i.e., institution) specific. Therefore, definitions of vitality must reflect both institutional type and mission.

MINNESOTA FACULTY VITALITY STUDY

Table 1. Descriptive Characteristics of Sample Groups

Response Categories	Representative (N=66)		Highly Active (N=63)		Delayed Promotion (N=32)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Rank:						
Full Professor	44	67	45	71	16	50
Assoc. Prof.	22	33	18	29	16	50
Field:						
Humanities	10	15	10	16	7	22
Soc. Sciences	25	38	22	35	9	28
Bio. Sciences	9	14	10	16	5	16
Phys. Sciences and Math	22	33	21	33	11	34
Sex:						
Male	61	92	56	89	31	97
Female	5	8	7	11	1	3
Age:						
30's	11	17	17	27	-	-
40's	27	41	25	40	21	66
50's	25	38	15	24	9	28
60's	3	5	6	10	2	6

MINNESOTA FACULTY VITALITY STUDY

Table 2. Faculty Work Styles

RESPONSE CATEGORIES	Representative (N=66)		Highly Active (N=63)		Delayed Promotion (N=32)	
	N	%[a]	N	%[a]	N	%[a]
Work Effort:						
Hours per week:						
50 or more	50	85	50	92	25	90
60 or more	17	29	25	46	6	22
Work harder than colleagues	21	36	37	69	7	24
Time Distribution:						
% Time Teaching:						
40 or more	28	56	14	28	16	58
50 or more	19	38	5	10	9	35
% Time Research:						
40 or more	30	55	28	53	12	48
50 or more	18	33	20	38	4	16
% Time Admin./Service:						
less than 20	27	52	21	43	15	58
over 30	15	29	17	34	7	28
Univ. Service:						
More involvement than colleagues in:						
University affairs	19	31	30	49	10	32
College affairs	22	36	39	65	8	27
Dept. affairs	36	56	48	79	15	50

[a]Percentages are based on the number that provided a codable response to question.

MINNESOTA FACULTY VITALITY STUDY

Table 3. Faculty Work Values

Response Categories	Representative (N=66) N	% [a]	Highly Active (N=63) N	% [a]	Delayed Promotion (N=32) N	% [a]
Interest Priorities:						
Research vs. teaching						
V. heavily to res.	8	13	18	31	5	16
Both; lean to res.	30	49	31	53	13	42
Both; lean to tea.	21	34	9	16	11	35
V. heavily to tea.	2	3	-	-	2	6
Other	-	-	3	5	-	-
Career Satisfactions: [b]						
Work w/students	32	49	19	32	14	47
Work with ideas	23	35	14	24	6	20
"Freedom"	18	28	23	39	9	30
Research	16	25	23	39	3	10
"Lifestyle"	13	20	12	20	7	23
Teaching	12	18	10	17	7	23
Career Dissatisfactions: [b]						
Committees/Admin./ Bureau. routines	31	50	23	40	20	36
Lack of financial reward	15	24	10	18	5	18
Lack of influence	12	19	8	14	6	21
Aspects of teach.	10	16	16	28	8	29
Funding diff.	8	13	7	12	2	7
Role fragmentation	5	8	14	25	3	11

[a] Percentages are based on the number that provided a codable response to question.

[b] Multiple-responses coded.

Table 4. Appraisals of Institutional Environment

Response Categories	Representative (N=66) N	Representative (N=66) %[a]	Highly Active (N=63) N	Highly Active (N=63) %[a]	Delayed Promotion (N=32) N	Delayed Promotion (N=32) %[a]
Supportive Conditions:[b]						
Supp. Environment	32	49	30	51	9	30
Fund. Availability	29	45	27	46	16	53
Leaves (SQL, Sab.)	21	32	10	17	11	37
Good teaching load	13	20	12	20	4	13
Good facilities	13	20	2	3	7	23
"Freedom"	10	15	18	31	5	17
Good grad students	4	6	4	7	2	7
Expanding field	2	3	4	7	2	7
Hindering Conditions:[b]						
Heav Tea/Adm Load	26	45	22	50	13	50
Non-supp. envir.	20	34	10	23	6	23
Lack of funding	17	29	11	25	6	23
Poor facilities	11	19	7	16	5	19
Lack res. time	3	5	3	7	4	15
Nature of field	3	5	1	2	-	-
Lack good grad st.	2	3	3	7	3	12
Perception of support of risk-taking:						
Discouraged	25	38	24	42	14	44
Under certain con.	16	25	13	23	18	41
Personally indiff. to systems attit.	15	23	8	14	4	12
Neutral	9	14	14	25	7	22
Encouraged	9	14	5	9	4	12

[a]Percentages are based on the number that provided a codable response to question.

[b]Multiple-responses coded.